

# The Joint Mandate Scheme

## A Turkish Empire Under American Protection



An American joint mandate for Constantinople, Anatolia, Armenia, Georgia and Azerbaijan will serve to

- I. Extend and consolidate the rule of the Turks and promote Pan-Turanianism;
- II. Kill the Armenian race and nationality;
- III. Smother Christianity in the Near East; and
- IV. Bring the forces of Mohammed under the influence of 24,000,000 Turanians preparatory to an eventual inevitable conflict between Islam and Christendom.

---

### *Articles by*

JAMES W. GERARD—"A Turkish 'Mandate'—Pan-Turanianism and Pan-Islamism Under American Protection."

GEN. BAGRATUNI—"Pan-Turanianism—a Serious Menace to the Peace of the World."

HENRY W. JESSUP—"American Aid to Armenia Without a Mandate."

L. P. CHAMBERS—"Armenia as a Barrier in the Way of Pan-Turanianism."

W. D. P. BLISS—"A Free All-Armenia vs. Turanian-Bolsheviki Alliance."

VAHAN CARDASHIAN—"A Turkish Scheme."



PAN-TURANIAN MAP

The Turks of Anatolia are Turanians by race. There are 19,000,000 other Turanians outside of Turkey who are separated from their kinsmen of Anatolia by Armenia. The Turks of Anatolia, in order to effect a junction with their fellow Turanians beyond Armenia, as a means of founding a Turkish State stretching from Constantinople to Central Asia, attempted the extermination of the Armenian race. (See Gen. Bagratuni's article in this book.)



ARMENIA AS IT WILL REAPPEAR ON THE MAP,—

According to the terms of a Memorandum officially presented by the Delegation of Integral Armenia to the Peace Conference in Paris, on February 26, 1919. Area, between 125,000 and 135,000 sq. m. Population, 4,300,000, divided approximately as follows: Armenians, 2,500,000; Other Christians, 500,000; Turks, Circassians, Arabs, Persians, 500,000; Tartars, 300,000; Kurds, 200,000; Other Religions, 300,000.

# The American Committee for the Independence of Armenia

---

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

**James W. Gerard, *Chairman***

Charles Evans Hughes  
Elihu Root  
Henry Cabot Lodge  
John Sharp Williams

Alfred E. Smith  
Frederic Courtland Penfield  
Charles W. Eliot  
Cleveland H. Dodge

---

## GENERAL COMMITTEE

**Charles Evans Hughes, *Honorary Chairman***

**James W. Gerard, *Chairman***

William Jennings Bryan  
Alton B. Parker  
Elihu Root  
Henry Cabot Lodge  
John Sharp Williams  
Charles S. Thomas  
Lyman Abbott  
Gov. Bartlett, N. H.  
James L. Barton  
Gov. Beeckman, R. I.  
Alice Stone Blackwell  
Charles J. Bonaparte  
Gov. Boyle, Nev.  
Nicholas Murray Butler  
Gov. Campbell, Ariz.  
Gov. Carey, Wyo.  
Gov. Catts, Fla.  
Gov. Cooper, S. C.  
Gov. Cox, Ohio  
Charles Stewart Davison  
Rt. Rev. J. H. Darlington  
Cleveland H. Dodge  
Gov. Dorsey, Ga.  
Charles W. Eliot  
Rt. Rev. William F. Faber  
Admiral Bradley A. Fiske  
Lindley M. Garrison  
James Cardinal Gibbons  
Martin H. Glynn  
Samuel Gompers  
Madison Grant  
Lloyd C. Griscom  
Gov. Harding, Iowa  
Gov. Harrington, Md.  
Albert Bushnell Hart  
Sara Duryea Hazen  
Myron T. Herrick

John Grier Hibben  
Gov. Holcomb, Conn.  
Hamilton Holt  
George A. Hurd  
Richard M. Hurd  
Henry W. Jessup  
Robert Ellis Jones  
Gov. Larrazolo, N. Mex.  
Gov. Lister, Wash.  
Edward C. Little  
Julian W. Mack  
Norman E. Mack  
William T. Manning  
Elizabeth Marbury  
Rt. Rev. Wm. H. Moreland  
Gov. Norbeck, S. Dak.  
Frederic C. Penfield  
George Haven Putnam  
Rt. Rev. P. N. Rhinelander  
Ernest W. Riggs  
Wm. Henry Roberts  
Gov. Robertson, Okla.  
Jacob G. Schurman  
Gov. Smith, N. Y.  
Gov. Sproul, Pa.  
Oscar S. Straus  
Rt. Rev. A. C. Thompson  
Gov. Townsend, Jr., Del.  
Rt. Rev. B. D. Tucker  
Rt. Rev. Wm. W. Webb  
Benjamin Ide Wheeler  
Everett P. Wheeler  
Rt. Rev. J. R. Winchester  
Stephen S. Wise  
Gov. Withycombe, Ore.  
Gov. Yager, Porto Rico

*The following memorandum was telegraphed to the President on December 18, 1919:*

TO THE PRESIDENT,

Washington, D. C.

"There is now a movement afoot designed to have America accept mandates in the Near East. We do not believe that the American people can be fairly asked to assume so hazardous a responsibility, or that they should assume an obligation under which the Turks will become the principal beneficiaries, with the unavoidable result that they will gain in strength and, at the termination of the term of our mandate, resume their national pastime of murder and rapine. We are confident that you cannot possibly sympathize with an arrangement that is advocated by the Turks themselves,—an arrangement which will offer them a favorable opportunity to promote their Pan-Turanian ambition, for the furtherance of which they entered the war and, as a preliminary step in their programme, attempted the extermination of the Armenian people. A joint mandate establishes a link between the Turks of Constantinople and of Anatolia, the Tartars of the Caucasus and the Turkomans, Uzbeks, Sarts, Bashkirs, Kirghisses and other Turanians beyond the Caspian, and thus plays into the hands of the Young Turks in their Pan-Turanian policy. We are now being asked to enable the Turks to achieve under our protection that which they failed to attain through the war. We feel that even the discussion of a mandate will postpone the adoption of what we believe should be our attitude toward Armenia.

Representative American opinion has already expressed itself with convincing emphasis in favor of the creation of an Armenian State that will unite Ararat with Cilicia and which alone can become an effective barrier against the Pan-Turanian ambition of the Turks of Anatolia. We believe the

American people will gladly sanction America's extending necessary aid to Armenia during her formative period. We therefore respectfully ask that the Administration declare itself in favor of America's extending direct aid to Armenia; to that end, formulate a definite continuing policy, and, as a preliminary step in that direction, recognize at once the Armenian Republic. This recognition will enable the Armenian government to borrow the necessary funds to meet the most pressing needs of its starving people, and will also be a practical step toward the creation of a united Armenia."

(Signed)

JAMES W. GERARD  
CHARLES EVANS HUGHES  
ALTON B. PARKER  
ELIHU ROOT  
FREDERIC COURTLAND PENFIELD  
NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER  
JACOB GOULD SCHURMAN  
JOHN GRIER HIBBEN  
PHILIP N. RHINELANDER  
BRADLEY A. FISKE



**Ex-President Eliot of Harvard, says:**

*"I hope America will help Armenia to organize a stable and independent government by lending her all necessary means."*

# **A TURKISH "MANDATE"**

## **Pan-Turanianism and Pan-Islamism Under American Protection**

By JAMES W. GERARD  
Ex-Ambassador to Germany

\* \* \*

The foundation of the international policy of the late Abd-ul-Hamid was based on the influence that he sought to exercise over the Islamic world. He became obsessed with the idea that if he could command the obedience of 200,000,000 Moslems under his sceptre, then the maintenance of his tottering throne could be made secure as against European encroachments.

So, he became the foremost Pan-Islamist of his time. But he did not succeed in his ultimate purpose.

The Young Turks saw the reason for the failure of the policy of Pan-Islamism pursued by Hamid. They realized that about five million Turks in the Turkish Empire could not possibly dominate the minds and hearts of the Islamic world. So, they thought that the first thing for them to do would be to effect a junction with their kinsmen,—the Tartars, Turkomans, Bashkirs, Uzbeks, Sarts and Kirghisses in the Caucasus and beyond the Caspian,—since all these tribes or races, like the Turks themselves, trace their origin to the Turanian stock. They believed that if they could accomplish that end, then there would be a homogeneous Turanian unit numbering about 24,000,000, and then they could set out to take up the Pan-Islamic policy of Abd-ul-Hamid. But the Turks of Anatolia were separated from their kinsmen of the Caucasus and the Trans-Caspian by the Armenians. Therefore, it was necessary for the Turks to get rid of the Armenians, as a preliminary step in the direction of pushing ahead their policy of Pan-Turanianism.

Thus, the Young Turks entered the war with the specific purpose of establishing a connecting link between themselves and the Tartars and other Turanians of the Caucasus and Trans-Caspian and of laying the foundation of a Turan-

ian Empire that would extend from the Golden Horn to Central Asia.

The Turks failed in attaining their objective through the war, because they were unable to get rid of the Armenians as thoroughly as they expected they would. They did destroy or disperse the majority of Turkish Armenians, but they were held up for over six months by Russian Armenians, and the ensuing armistice hindered the further operation of their Pan-Turanian scheme.

**We are now being asked to enable the Turks to achieve under our protection that which they failed to attain through the war.**

That is what a joint mandate by America for the major portion of the former Turkish Empire and of the Transcaucasus means. The Turks are heartily and extremely anxious that America should accept such a mandate. They hope that through American capital and constructive genius they will be educated and reorganized in the course of twenty or thirty years, when, through the sympathy and support of Islam, they will be sufficiently strong to defy the Christian world.

A joint mandate for the regions above indicated may be of some practical interest to certain financiers and ambitious politicians. Such an arrangement may also suggest some fascinating opportunity for missionaries to convert the Turks or other Islamic races. But it ought not to be forgotten by our good American missionary friends that as long as a Turkish political unit exists, so long will it be well nigh impossible to make inroads into the religion of the Turk,—a religion which the Turk proposes to use as an instrument for the promotion of his political ambitions.

**An American joint mandate, such as the one that is being advocated, will serve to extend and consolidate the rule of the Turks and promote Pan-Turanianism; kill the Armenian race and nationality; smother Christianity in the Near East, and bring the forces of Mohammed under the influence of 24,000,000 or more Turanians preparatory to an eventual inevitable conflict between Islam and Christendom.**

A joint mandate is absolutely and clearly a scheme in the interest and for the benefit of the Turks and only of the Turks.



It has been asserted by certain persons that the creation of an Armenian State is impracticable. The creation of an Armenian State will be impracticable if we confine that State only to the mountainous district of Armenia; but when we bring the boundaries of that State down to the Mediterranean, as we must, then Armenia will be self-sufficient and self-supporting. That the Turks have destroyed one-half out of the million and a half Armenians who lived in Turkish Armenia is a gruesome fact; but we shall not permit the Turks to be benefited by a majority gained by murder.

When some people talk of the impracticability of creating an Armenian State they mean this: The Turks have already destroyed one-half and driven from their homes the other half of the Armenian population of Turkish Armenia. So, we should recognize the condition that the Turks have created; compensate the Turks by turning Turkish Armenia over to them; confine the Armenians to Russian Armenia, which alone cannot, of course, become a self-sufficient economic bloc, and, therefore, no Armenian State can or should be created.

*Armenia, extending from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean, separates the Turks of Anatolia from their kinsmen of the Caucasus and Trans-Caspian, and thus puts an end to a movement which is plainly dangerous to the peace of the world. Then it follows that, if there were no Armenia, the interest of Christian civilization would require that one should be created.*

It shall be the task of America, and for that matter of Christendom, to permit the Armenian refugees to get back to their homes; offer about a million Armenians in other countries to return to the land of their forefathers, and rescue about two hundred thousand Armenian women and children who are now living a life of misery and shame in the harems of the Turks and of the Kurds. These things can be done, if America were to lend moral and economic aid to Armenia. That done, the Armenians will constitute over sixty per cent. of the population of Armenia to be.

*When we recall the fact that the Turks in Turkey were never over twenty-five per cent. of the population of the Turkish Empire, then we must conclude that the Armenians, in point of numbers, will estab-*

*lish a satisfactory claim to the possession of their own land.*

The Armenians ask America to aid them during their formative period. They want us to lend them economic aid, and civil and military advisory aid, and also about one regiment of American troops. The Armenian government can easily create a force of 50,000 trained men (that government now has 18,000 men under arms), if we supply necessary equipment. I am informed that this force will be ample for the occupation of the non-occupied parts of Armenia. The small American contingent that is required is intended to accompany the Armenian army of occupation, so that the Turks and the Kurds may know that the Armenians are engaged in a legitimate errand by the authority of the Peace Conference and that they do not mean to hurt them, and also that they may know that America is back of Armenia, so that no unnecessary resistance may be offered, if any.

The Armenians now have a government in northern Armenia, known as the Republic of Armenia. That government has been in existence now for over eighteen months. It is not, of course, as efficient a machine as it ought to be; but in view of the most difficult conditions under which it has been brought into being, it would be unfair to expect of it a greater measure of stability and efficiency. A nation whose members are forced to live on a quarter of a pound of bread per day can hardly be expected to be very efficient.

That the Armenians possess sufficient moral fitness for self-rule has never been seriously questioned. According to districts, the rate of literacy among the Armenians ranges from 35% to 75%. The Armenians are the best educated people in the Near East and South-Eastern Europe. I understand that there were, in 1914, six thousand Armenian students in the colleges and universities of Russia alone, and that in 1914 there were over 15,000 Armenians in Russia who had received a college or university education. The Armenians in Russia number about 2,000,000.

I believe that America will aid Armenia to become a free and independent nation. I also believe that the American people will have nothing to do with a proposition under which the murderous Turks are to share with the survivors of their victims the advantages of American aid and efforts.

## PLEDGES MADE TO ARMENIA BY THE STATESMEN AND LEADERS OF THE ALLIED AND ASSOCIATED POWERS.

---

President Wilson, in his message of January 8, 1918, conceded to Armenia the right to "fullest autonomy."

\* \* \*

Mr. Lloyd George, on January 5, 1918, solemnly declared in the House of Commons that the recognition of the separate condition of Armenia shall constitute one of the war aims of Great Britain.

\* \* \*

Mr. Balfour, replying to an interpellation by Mr. Ramsay MacDonald in the House of Commons on July 11th, 1918, said:

"His Majesty's Government is following with earnest sympathy and admiration the gallant resistance of the Armenians (in the Caucasus) in defence of their liberties and honour. I would refer the Honorable Member to the public statements made by leading statesmen among the Allied Powers in favor of a settlement (of the Armenian Case) upon the principle of self-determination."

\* \* \*

M. Clemenceau, by a letter dated July, 1918, and addressed to the Armenian National Delegation, Paris, said:

"France, the victim of the most unjust of aggressions, has included in her peace terms the liberation of oppressed nations.

"The spirit of self-abnegation of the Armenians, their loyalty towards the Allies, their contributions to the Foreign Legion, to the Caucasian front, and to the Oriental Legion have strengthened the ties that connect them with France.

"I am happy to confirm to you that the government of the Republic, like that of Great Britain, has not ceased to place the Armenian nation among the peoples whose fate the Allies intend to settle according to the supreme laws of Humanity and Justice."

\* \* \*

Baron Sonino, Italian Foreign Minister, on February 8, 1919, cabled Mr. Gerard, Chairman, The American Committee for the Independence of Armenia, that,

"I am very happy of the occasion offered me to express once more the sentiments of heartfelt sympathy with which the Royal Government follows the constant and noble efforts of Armenia for her independence and unity.

\* \* \*

*On December 10, 1918, Senator Lodge offered a resolution in the Senate in favor of the independence of Armenia, comprising Russian Armenia, Persian Armenia, and Turkish Armenia, including Cilicia. This resolution was reoffered by him in May, 1919, and it has been re-embodied in the resolution of Senator Williams, dated Sept. 9, 1919.*

\* \* \*

*At a banquet held under the auspices of the American Committee for the Independence of Armenia, on February 8, 1919, a representative American audience, after having heard Mr. Justice Hughes, Ex-Secretary Bryan, and Ex-Ambassador Gerard, adopted the resolution of Senator Lodge as the platform of the American Committee.*

\* \* \*

On March 3, 1919, The American Committee For The Independence Of Armenia presented to President Wilson two sets of printed petitions, signed by Twenty thousand Ministers, Rectors and Priests; 85 Bishops; 40 Governors of the States and 250 College and University Presidents, whereby the petitioners respectfully asked the President

"to do your utmost to secure and insure the Independence of Armenia, including the Six Vilayets, Cilicia and the littoral of Trebizonde in Turkish Armenia; Russian Armenia and Persian Armenia; to exert your great influence to the end that the Peace Conference may make requisite arrangements for helping Armenia to establish an independent Republic, and to obtain adequate reparation for the terrible losses the Armenian people have suffered during the war."

# PAN-TURANIANISM—A SERIOUS MENACE TO THE PEACE OF THE WORLD

By MAJOR-GENERAL BAGRATUNI

Former Chief of Russian Army Intelligence Service of Turkestan;  
Former Commander-in-Chief of the Petrograd Military District, etc.

\* \* \*

In 1914, a society was organized in Constantinople, styled as the Yeni-Turan Society (meaning, New Turan), of which Enver Pasha, the then Turkish Minister of War, became President. The Turks of Constantinople and of Anatolia belong to the Turanian branch of the human family who migrated from Central Asia to their present habitat during the 10th, 11th, and succeeding centuries. The purpose of the Yeni-Turan Society was to establish a connecting link between the Turanians of Anatolia and Constantinople and those of the Caucasus and the Transcaspian, and to found a Turkish State, stretching from Thrace to Central Asia, with its capital at Constantinople. The Young Turks earnestly started the Pan-Turanian movement in 1908, at the time of their accession to power, when I had occasion to order the arrest of several of their emessaries from Constantinople, who were conducting Pan-Turanian propaganda in Turkestan.

The Turanians number about 24,000,000, of whom 19,000,000 live outside the boundaries of the former Turkish Empire. There are seven principal distinct branches of them with minor sub-branches. They are to be found in patches, or connecting blocks, in Thrace, Anatolia, the Transcaucasus, northern Persia, the western, northern, and northwestern coasts of the Caspian, and beyond the Caspian, in the regions of Orenburg, Samara, Kazan, Ufa, and within the boundaries of Chinese Turkestan and the northern frontiers of India.

\* \* \*

The titles, the habitat and the estimated numbers of the principal Turanian races are indicated below:

## 1. TURKS:

In Constantinople region, in Anatolia, with consid-

- |   |           |
|---|-----------|
| erable numbers in parts of Armenia and southern Caucasus. ....  | 5,000,000 |
| <b>2. TARTARS, KUMUKS and NOGHAI:</b>   |           |
| In northern Persia, eastern Transcaucasus, centered at Baku, and northwestern coast of the Caspian, and in Ural-Volga regions.....  | 5,000,000 |
| <b>3. BASHKIRS:</b>   |           |
| In the region of Astrakhan and south of Ufa.....  | 1,500,000 |
| <b>4. TURKOMANS:</b>  |           |
| Along the eastern coast of the Caspian, around Aral Sea, in the region of Khiva and northwestern part of Persia .....   | 1,200,000 |
| <b>5. UZBEKS and SARTS:</b>   |           |
| In the regions of Khiva, Bokhara and Tashkend, and spread over as far as Pamir, northern frontier of India and western China.....   | 3,500,000 |
| <b>6. KIRGHISSES:</b>   |           |
| In northwestern Turkestan. They constitute a link between the Tartars of Ufa, the Bashkirs of Astrakhan, the Turkomans of the eastern coast of the Caspian, the Uzbeks and the Sarts of Tashkend and the Kashgarlyks and the Tarantchys of China..... | 6,000,000 |
| <b>7. KASHGARLYKS and TARANTCHYS and others:</b>  |           |
| They are the two principal Turanian races in western China. ....  | 2,000,000 |

All these races trace their origin to the Turanian stock; they speak allied languages or dialects, and profess Moham-medanism.

If we permit the Turks of Constantinople and of Anatolia, who initiated and direct the Pan-Turanian movement, to establish a connecting link with their kinsmen beyond Armenia, then they will have no serious difficulty in building up a homogeneous Turanian State, and later in commanding the sympathy and support of the Islamic world, particularly of the 67,000,000 or more Moslems of India. Possibly the only two Islamic nations that cannot be won over by them are the Persians and the Arabs of Arabia.

The Young Turks entered the war for the purpose of pushing their Pan-Turanian ambition to a successful conclusion, and, therefore, attempted to exterminate the Armenian people who stood in the way of their objective. They failed. But they have not given up that scheme. There is only one way by which Pan-Turanianism, as it is understood by the

Young Turks, can be gotten rid of. That can be done by separating the Turks of Anatolia from the Turanians of the Caucasus and beyond the Caspian.

**An Armenian State, stretching from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean, can become that separating barrier. Therefore, I agree with Ambassador Gerard that, if there were no Armenia, the interest of western civilization would demand that one should be created.**

If the Armenians are given a little initial help, they can successfully defend the frontier of western civilization against the schemes of Asiatic marauders. I am acquainted with all the races and nationalities of the near and middle east, and I can say that the Armenian makes a better soldier than the men of any race in those regions. The Turanians, the Persians, the Kurds and others have considerable power of physical endurance, but they lack the dash, the skill, the discipline and the patriotic idealism of the Armenian soldier, who is the equal of the best Aryan soldier.



**Benjamin Ide Wheeler, President,** University of California, says:

*"I think that the United States ought to assume the care and oversight of Armenia's interest if she does it for any nation. The intervention need not be expected to last many years. The Armenians understand self-government and will adjust themselves to the modern demands thereof very quickly. We know them as a people better, probably, than any other Eastern stock, and we have occasion to sympathize with them and the Greeks who are in like estate."*

## CILICIA—THE LUNGS OF ARMENIA

\* \* \*

Cilicia is the Mediterranean outlet of Armenia. Under the provisions of the Anglo-French Sykes-Picot Compact of 1916, Cilicia was allotted to France. In 1917, following the defection of Russia and the entry of America into the war, the Armenians, in view of the repeated declarations made by the statesmen and leaders of the Allied and Associated Powers in favor of the principle of self-determination of peoples, set themselves to the task of lending as much military assistance to the Allied arms as it lay within their power. It is a fact of common knowledge that the Armenians of Russian Armenia took over the Caucasus front in the winter of 1917 and fought the advancing Turks for over five months. And the Armenians in foreign countries organized volunteer battalions, of which they placed eight at the disposal of France in Palestine. The only other troops France had under her flag in Palestine were about 300 Syrians and a battalion of Algerians. The Armenians fought under the supreme command of General Allenby, and according to his testimony, took a leading part in the victory of Allenby over the Turks. These troops occupied the coast of Lebanon for France, and they also occupied Cilicia. The French commanders who led the Armenians to Cilicia told them that they were on their way to the redemption of their fatherland. But now that the war is over, a great many Frenchmen feel that the cotton fields and the iron ores of Cilicia ought not to pass out of the hands of France. Also, some people think that the Armenians have been terribly reduced in numbers, and that, therefore, it would be best for them that Cilicia be not made a part of Armenia. The Armenians object to this line of reasoning on practical grounds, which may be summarized as follows:

**1. Cilicia is about 15,000 square miles in area, or it constitutes about one-eighth part of Armenia.**

If the seven-eighths are not beyond the capacity of the Armenians to carry, an additional one-eighth part would not too heavily weigh on them. Cilicia has today a population of 415,000, out of which about 200,000 are Armenians, 95,000 Moslems, and the balance other elements. Possibly not 1,000 out of these 200,000 Armenians would



move out of Cilicia, if Cilicia were to be detached from Armenia. If Cilicia were to be detached from Armenia, several hundred thousand Armenians, who would otherwise immigrate into Armenia from foreign countries, would remain where they now are. If Cilicia were to be detached from Armenia, a considerable number of Armenians who are now in the interior of Armenia will move to Cilicia. Thus, the severance of Cilicia from Armenia will be a deterrent factor to the emigration to Armenia of hundreds of thousands of Armenians who are now in foreign countries.

## 2. Cilicia is the essential economic artery of Armenia.\*

Armenia major is surrounded on all sides by Tartars, Persians, Arabs and Turks and Cilicia offers Armenia the only outlet through which she can establish direct contact with the civilized world.

## 3. Cilicia is historically an integral part of Armenia.

Over 3,300 years ago, when the Armenians first immigrated into Asia Minor from their original home in South-eastern Europe, they lived for several hundred years in Northern Cilicia. Again, when they lost the kingdom of Armenia Major in the eleventh century, they returned to Cilicia, and there they established and maintained the Kingdom of Lesser Armenia or Cilicia from 1080-1375. During the mediæval ages, the ten harbors of this kingdom were among the most renowned in the Mediterranean, and the Gulf of Alexandretta and its adjacent waters were known as the Sea of Armenia. This kingdom became the base and the ally of the Crusaders. Following the downfall of all of the five States, which the Crusaders had founded in the East, Lesser Armenia, single-handed, fought and retarded the westerly advance of the Mameluke and the Turko-Tartar, for a period of 85 years.†

---

\* Armenia should include the Russian and Turkish Armenias, with outlets at Trebizonde and on the Mediterranean, in Cilicia, the ancient home of Armenia. Without Cilicia, Armenia will be like a man without a pair of lungs—will be asphyxiated.—From an editorial headed "The Passing of Turkey," in *The Evening Post*, N. Y., Nov. 1, 1918.

† In May, 1895, following the 1894 massacre, the Ambassadors of the Powers at Constantinople agreed upon a set of reform measures for all of Turkish Armenia, including the Six Provinces and Cilicia, to which the Sultan gave his adhesion. This new reform measure, like its predecessors, has not been carried out. The boundaries of Armenia—Turkish, Russian and Persian—are as well defined and fixed as those of England.

The staff of experts on Near East of the American Peace Mission to the Peace Conference recommended that Cilicia be made a part of Armenia.

The President, by a cable dated March 20, 1919, and addressed to Mr. Bryan, expressed himself as being in sympathy with the attitude of the Armenians on the subject of Cilicia.

On February 16, 1919, the New York Times said editorially:

*"One thing is to be made secure—that there is to be no Armenian irredenta, in so far as the overlapping of populations may make it possible. Armenia has earned the right to full national liberty. Cilicia is within the sphere of influence allotted to France by the treaties of 1916, but French economic interest could be guaranteed without interfering with the political sovereignty of the Armenians in Armenian territory.*

*"The Armenians were mistreated chiefly because they were Christians and held to their religion inflexibly, incidentally because they were economically superior to the Turks and dangerous to the Germans.*

*"A nation that has been sacrificed for the faith and the civilization of Europe should not again be betrayed, in whole or in part, by Europe and America.*

*"Armenia is as much a moral test of the Peace Conference as is Belgium."*

From the point of view of the interest of France, it would be extremely unfortunate if France were to insist on the possession of Cilicia.

V. C.



## AMERICAN AID TO ARMENIA WITHOUT A MANDATE

By HENRY W. JESSUP

\* \* \*

In an analysis of the League Covenant in the League of Nations Magazine for June, 1919, I pointed out that the development of certain backward nations under Art. XXII of the revised Covenant formed "a sacred trust of civilization," and that peoples not yet able to stand by themselves were contemplated as infants in international law, for whom the League of Nations might appoint guardians, who would be subject to all the duties and obligations of such an officer, but with the same difference in the relationship of tutelage as obtains in our municipal law where a guardian acts for an infant under fourteen and for one over fourteen. And taking the example of Armenia, I quoted the fourth paragraph of Art. XXII: "Certain communities, formerly belonging to the Turkish Empire, have reached a stage of development where **their existence as independent nations can be provisionally recognized**, subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance by a mandatarly until such time as they are able to stand alone." This differentiates such a people as the Armenians from the peoples of Central Africa, for example. As to such latter wards of civilization nothing is said as to consulting their wishes in the selection of the mandatarly or in the determination of the character of the mandate, but in regard to the illustration of Armenia, it is obvious that its wishes "must be a principal consideration in the selection of the mandatarly," and in respect to the latter, Par. II of Art. XXII applies, with its phrase as to entrusting tutelage of this ward to such "advanced nation . . . willing to accept."

During the past few years nearly every household in the United States has had its sympathies and interest aroused to the extent of contributing to the assistance of the Armenian people, tortured, slaughtered and deported by the savage Turks and Kurds. But the idea of our Government accepting a mandate and becoming accountable to some super-government has met with much antagonism,

and at the same time the new republic of Armenia has itself considered whether, if it be recognized as a sovereign nation by the great powers, it will not itself diminish its sovereignty and impair its dignity by accepting the position of the ward of a mandatary. The question thus emerges whether the result which the majority of the American public wishes to accomplish cannot be secured without running counter to either of these prejudices. I believe that this can be accomplished through the ordinary instrumentalities of diplomatic relationship.

A. Let the Government of the United States recognize the new republic of Armenia as a sovereign nation and appoint a minister as its diplomatic representative to negotiate a treaty with the new republic, under which administrative advice and assistance may be afforded, with all the advantages and none of the disadvantages inherent in the scheme of the covenant of the League of Nations. The Council of The League would welcome the elimination of this one problem in the Near East from its own agenda, and the influence of the United States when a member of The League, or even sooner, could be exerted in demanding the delimitation, under an International Boundary Commission, of the territorial boundaries to be granted to the new republic.

B. The nature of the administrative advice and assistance and the extent to which it shall be given would then repose where it really belongs, and the governments directly interested would determine whether the treaty should cover merely financial assistance or the appointment of administrators of the finances of Armenia until such time as it should be able to repay any loan which we might make, or whether it should extend to the furnishing of munitions and men to enforce the "No Trespassing" signs that would be set up against the Turks and Kurds and the Tartars and Georgians. But it seems clear that if the moral influence of **Might plus Right** is to be greater now than it was before the Great War, the fact that we are the ally of Armenia, or that we are back of the new government with money, and with men if need be, would be as effective against these savages of the Turkish Empire as the actual sending of troops.

C. Under such a treaty the Armenians, with American administrative advice, could develop the great agricultural and mineral resources of the nation, and I venture to predict that in ten years the republic could be self-supporting and

in twenty years the United States' loan would have been repaid.

D. One great fact must be ever kept in mind in viewing this whole subject, and that is, that the moment security of life and liberty is assured in the provinces of their former domicile, the men and the families of Armenia would repatriate themselves by tens of thousands, for it is only the extremities of persecution and torture that ever drove them from their native land.

This solution is consistent with the desires of the recently organized government of the Armenian republic. It is consistent with the theory underlying the covenant of the League of Nations, but it is totally inconsistent with the suggestion, made by apparently well-meaning but singularly ill-advised, self-styled "friends of Turkey," that the United States should accept a mandate for Armenia and Turkey together. Is our memory so short that we can contemplate making any covenant of assistance directly or through the League with the heirs, executors, administrators or assigns of Abdul the Damned? The Turks have no claim on American affection or respect. A mandate for Turkey and Armenia together would be a travesty on common sense. The peoples are not *e jusedem generis*. Their interests are mutually hostile. It reminds one of the American showman in Vienna before the war who exhibited a "Happy Family" in a cage, consisting of a leopard, a wolf, a hyena and a lamb, and when asked how long they had cohabited the cage, he replied, "Two years—but," he added meditatively, "the lamb has to be renewed occasionally."

The United States wants no hyena farms. Let Europe or the League solve the Turkish situation. Europe created it by her selfishness and jealousies. Internationalize Constantinople if you like, but limit the Turks to Anatolia. They can possibly govern themselves, although incapable of justly governing others. Give them Greek neighbors on the western Asia Minor littoral and a strong Armenia on the east and to the south, and let us confine our national aid to those worthy of it, who can be trusted to profit by it, whose sufferings have won sympathy in hundreds of thousands of American homes.

If, under treaty with Armenia, entered into with her as a sovereign state duly recognized by our State Department, we extend aid and protection, then, I say, if the Turks aggress again, teach them as the men of Succoth were taught.

It is the only lesson they deserve or have the wit to comprehend.

Finally, the argument for our taking on the Near East is based entirely on philanthropic grounds. If it wins out, it will be because it appeals to Americans determined to restore her rights to stricken Armenia. Hence it is gross fallacy to reason, as some do, that because the Turks, by massacre and deportation, have eliminated the Armenians as a present factor in certain provinces, therefore those provinces must not be included in New Armenia. That would be to effectuate the very purpose the Turks have pursued all along. Shall the United States pull Turkish chestnuts from the still smouldering fires of brutal persecution?

\* \* \*

## A RESTORED ARMENIA

By EDWARD C. LITTLE

\* \* \*

"Armenia should extend from the Mediterranean to include Adana clear to the Caucasus. While the Armenians are not as thick around there as they would be if they hadn't killed so many of them, they are the intellectual force and the progressive factor in all that country through there, and with a little encouragement would soon dominate it thoroughly.

"All that the Armenians really need or seriously seek is a policeman's commission to enforce laws in that country. They can do the rest. In my experience on the western frontier, I learned that the gun-man who was a policeman generally got the better of the gun-man who was an outlaw, because he had a better backing and it put the other fellow upon the defensive, everything else being equal. At present Turkey is the gun-man with the policeman's badge through all that country. Give Armenia that and it will come out all right.

"However, it probably would add considerably to their prestige and standing if America accepted the task of aiding Armenia and perhaps established a regiment of marines for a while at the Mediterranean end of Armenia."

## AMERICAN AID TO ARMENIA

\* \* \*

*If America were to assume the task of aiding Armenia, she would be called upon to:*

**A. Secure from the Powers the recognition of the independence of Armenia, including Russian and Turkish Armenias, with its littorals on the Black and Mediterranean Seas.**

**B. Secure for Armenia adequate indemnity.**

There are several ways by which an indemnity may be secured. Possibly the most feasible one is the following:

Assess the Turkish public debt of about \$800,000,000 on the several dismembered parts of Turkey, except one, namely, Constantinople; impose on Constantinople a certain tax as its share of the Turkish public debt, and assign that sum to Armenia as her indemnity.

**C. Send to Armenia civil and military missions, whose functions shall be to reorganize the Armenian Government, and exercise over it a necessary measure of advisory supervision for a period of five to ten years;**

**D. Dispatch to Armenia possibly one regiment of troops for a brief period.**

The Armenian Republic, (in the Caucasus), which includes about one-half of the Armenians that are to be in united Armenia, can easily create a force of 50,000 men. This size of a force will be ample for the protection of the frontiers of Armenia and the occupation of the non-occupied parts of Armenia. The small American force that is required is to accompany the Armenian regiments into the non-occupied parts of Armenia, as a notice to the Turks and Kurds that the Armenians are engaged in a legitimate errand by authority of the Peace Conference and also as an evidence of the active interest that America takes in the welfare of Armenia.



## ARMENIA AS A BARRIER IN THE WAY OF PAN-TURANIANISM

BY L. P. CHAMBERS, PH.D.

Professor of Psychology and Philosophy,  
American College for Girls, Constantinople

\* \* \*

The great war was fought to establish the right of small nations to freedom and self-determination; and there were certain territorial adjustments which followed so inevitably from these principles that they themselves took on the dignity of principles and were embodied by President Wilson in his fourteen points and by Premier Lloyd George in his statement of the aims of the war. Among these territorial adjustments were included the return of Alsace-Lorraine to France, the restoration of Polish independence, and the liberation of the subject races of Turkey. So axiomatic, indeed, were these points regarded that anyone who ventured to suggest that Alsace-Lorraine be left to Germany or that Poland be not set free, would have been charged not only with enmity to France and Poland, but also with treason to the sacred cause which the Entente armies had espoused. But the liberation of the subject races of Turkey from the brutality of Turkish misrule is no less sacred a task in this Twentieth Century Crusade; and already Arab and Jew have secured their independence. Not so, however, the Armenians who are yet awaiting the decisions of the Peace Conference with regard to Turkey. If, however, having established freedom and justice throughout the greater part of the world, the Allies should fail to secure Armenian independence, whether because of Turkish threats, or because Armenia is small and remote and not worth the trouble, or again because they are unable to harmonize their conflicting interests in Turkey,—it would be evidence of the lack of sincerity in our pretensions that we are fighting for the establishment of a principle, not merely in self-defense, and not at all for gain.

It is sometimes argued that the granting of independence to the Armenian provinces of Turkey would be a violation of Turkey's rights. But no nation can claim for itself a



right which it refuses to accord to another. The right which any nation claims to independence is based on the same right of all. To be an ardent advocate of Armenian independence is not, therefore, a mark of Turkophobia; for the claim of the Armenians is based on the principle adopted by the Peace Conference, that any people, whether Armenians or Turks, are worthy of independence as soon as they prove themselves capable of self-government. Britain is seeking to extend this principle to India and to Egypt; and the United States to the Philippines. On the same principle, not only have Poland, Tcheko-Slovakia and Yugo Slavia been liberated, but also Arabia and Palestine. Some of these new States may require for a while the protection and guidance of a mandatory, and Armenia no less than others. But it is hard to believe that any solution of the Armenian problem which would leave the Armenians the only unliberated nation in the Near East, should be contemplated by any one who is in sympathy with the aims of this war as enunciated by the Allied statesmen and by President Wilson.

But the Armenians, it is urged, are so scattered and decimated that nowhere, not even in Armenia proper, do they form a majority of the population; so that the Armenian minority would be dominated by the Moslem majority and their independence would gain them nothing, or else the Moslem majority would be dominated by an Armenian minority, which would not be just. But even if the assertion that there are more Moslems than Armenians in Armenia be true, this must not be confounded with a Turkish majority; for the Moslems of Armenia are Kurds, Circassians, Lazes, etc., with comparatively few Turks. Furthermore, with the Armenian, love of country is an obsession, almost a mania, and thousands of Armenians the world over, including those scattered throughout Turkey, are eagerly awaiting the opportune moment to return "home." This is not a mere fond hope; it is a settled resolution. And the return of her scattered sons will in a few years give the Armenian a decided majority in his own land. Moreover, with the union of Russian Armenia with Turkish Armenia, the Armenian element will constitute the majority population in Armenia.

But there is another side to this question. If the Armenian is not now in the majority in Turkish Armenia, it is because a more than Prussian brutality has by the thousands driven him to exile or done him to death. And to accept this fact as an argument against erecting Armenia into an inde-

pendent state, would be to sanction the methods whereby the present state of affairs was brought about. But just as he is no true friend of the criminal who enables him to escape a just punishment, so is he no true friend of the Turk who would allow him to retain power over a race he has so cruelly misruled. For if the Turk is ever to learn to rule, he must be taught that misrule will not be tolerated by humanity. But to refuse the plea of the Armenian race for independence, after all the atrocities they have suffered at the hands of the Turks, would be equivalent to condoning the Armenian massacres as a method of government; and to condone pillage, rape and massacre as a method of government would not only be an eternal disgrace to civilization, but would also confirm the Turk in brutality. Britain learned her greatest lesson in colonial administration, when the thirteen American colonies revolted against injustice and secured their independence.

If Turkey is ever to learn the lesson of just administration, she must learn it in the same way; for unless she loses the land she has maladministered, the lesson will never be learned; and subject Turk as well as subject Armenian will be doomed to remain the hapless prey of a corrupt bureaucracy.

But it is feared that an independent Armenian Republic, surrounded on all sides by hostile Moslem hordes, would be difficult to protect. It is not, however, Armenia, but the Armenians who are to be protected; and to leave the Armenians under the Turks, far from being a protection, would simply expose them to a continuation of the brutal oppression from which they seek to escape. Any one who supposes that the Armenians would be protected under Turkish rule, has not learned the lesson of six hundred years. The Turkish theory of government is that of the absolute subjection of conquered races. The equality of all races and justice for all he may profess by his lips; but these ideas are utterly foreign to his theory and practice of government. As an independent state, the Armenians could arm in self-defense; but as a subject race, any resistance, armed or unarmed, which they might oppose to Turkish oppression, would be regarded as sedition and punished by brutal reprisals, as has been done in the past. Indeed, the Turk is already threatening reprisals against the Armenian, inasmuch as he, inspired by the declarations and promises of Allied statesmen, openly voiced his aspirations and hopes for an inde-

pendent Armenia. But to have aroused Armenian hopes, only to disappoint them at the last; to have encouraged them to speak of "freedom" and then to leave them to the mercy of a government which would not fail to punish them for having used that word, would be a base betrayal of a small but valiant race. Nor, if Armenia remained a province of Turkey, could the League of Nations interfere in the internal affairs of Turkey, in case of Armenian massacres; whereas the League would be pledged to protect an independent Armenia against territorial aggression from outside. Only as an independent state, then, have the Armenians any chance of protection from Turkish oppression.

**Furthermore, the creation of an independent Armenia is necessary if the world is to be freed from the Pan-Turanian menace. It is because Armenia lies across the path of a mid-Asiatic Turanian Empire, to extend from Thrace to Chinese Turkestan, and from Central Russia to India, that Turkey most bitterly opposes Armenian independence.**

But this war was a struggle between two ideals—that of world dominating empire and that of a league of free nations; and the latter ideal won, as indeed it was bound to do if there is any right in justice and any righteousness with God. Hence, to refuse Armenia's plea to come into the League of Nations as an independent state would be not only a palpable violation of the ideal for which this war was fought and won, but it would be a violation of that ideal in favor of its opposite ideal, the ideal that made the war and lost it. Pan-Germanism, Pan-Turanianism, Pan-Islamism, Pan-Mongolianism, Pan-Slavism, Pan-Anglosaxonism, all belong to a day that is past. We are entering upon an era not of domination by one race, but of the co-operation of all. It is, however, only because he dreams of an empire that once was and might possibly again come to be that the Turk desires to retain Armenia. If Turkey is ever to be a bona-fide member of a league of free democracies, she must give up her imperial ideas and welcome Armenia also, as a free nation, into that league.

There are some who would wish to conciliate Moslem public opinion in India, Egypt and elsewhere, by not further mutilating the empire of the Caliph. But Moslem Indian troops assisted in the capture of Jerusalem and of Bagdad;

for this was not a war between Moslem and Christian, but between tyranny and democracy, and the Moslems of India recognize in British liberal traditions the safeguard of their rights. It is Turkish atrocities that have brought indignity upon the Caliphate, and not the victory of Entente arms in Palestine and Mesopotamia. The liberation of Armenia might work injury to the imperialistic dreams of the Sultan-Caliph, recently ally of the Hun, but it cannot affect his moral prestige. It is the corruption and cruelty of Turkish rule which has dealt that a serious blow, and the liberation of Arabia and Palestine have seemed but the natural result of Turkish misrule. One of the liberated states, however, is a Moslem state, the home of Islam and of its earliest Caliphs. With Mecca, Medina, Bagdad and Jerusalem lost to him, the retention of Van and Erzroom is a matter of utter insignificance, as far as the religious prestige of the Caliph is concerned. The danger of arousing Moslem public opinion by a further reduction of Turkish territory is the least of the problems raised by Armenia's liberation.

On the other hand, the failure to recognize Armenian independence would raise more difficulties than it would avoid. A just solution of the Armenian question will ultimately solve its own problems; an unjust solution would continually create new ones.

*It is because it is a question of justice and not of prudence merely, that the advocacy of Armenian independence seems to me to be the duty of those who are interested in the future of the Armenian people, but also of those who are interested in the cause of human liberty the world over.*

It is not a question of liking or disliking the Armenians as a people. Like all other peoples, the Armenian character possesses its proportion of defects and virtues. But above all, they are a people endowed with a keen sense of nationality and an ardent yearning for liberty. And of all peoples in the world, the democracies of Britain, France, Italy and the United States should be the last to turn a deaf ear to the appeal of any people for independence.



## WHY TAKE TURKEY?

An Editorial in the N. Y. Times, Tuesday, Nov. 4, 1919

\* \* \*

There is much to be said in favor of an American mandate for Armenia. Something can be said, though not very much, in favor of an American mandate for Constantinople. More can be said against it. It is hard to see what can be said in favor of an American mandate for a residuary Turkish state in Anatolia; or, worst of all, for an American mandate over the whole Turkish Empire.

Perhaps something can be said for it, but it has not been said yet. Mr. Grasty's dispatch in Sunday's Times presented the arguments which are being made in Paris by those who favor an American mandate for what is described as "all the Turkish-speaking territory," but which turns out in fact to be the Turkish-speaking territory, plus the territory where Greek or Armenian is the principal language, plus the Trans-Caucasian republics of Georgia, Russian-Armenia, and Azerbaijan, which suddenly comes into the argument out of nowhere in particular. The reasons given for this piece of statecraft are somewhat diverse. We are to save the remains of Turkey from the rivalries of European powers, which sounds like the argument of somebody who does not like the Greeks. "A mandate for Armenia in order to be successful would have to include Constantinople," because one-eighth of the population of that city is Armenian; which is equivalent to saying that an Irish republic would have to include Boston, or that union of Yugoslavia would be incomplete without the mining districts of Western Pennsylvania.

Another argument is that it would save the feelings of the Turks, "who are willing to have properly accredited Armenians formerly resident in Turkey come back, but don't want Russian Armenians." It may be that the world will have to submit to Turkish ideas as to what Armenians are properly accredited, but America does not want to become accessory after—and perhaps before—the fact of murder and worse crimes.

"A mandate for Armenia alone would be a gold brick," but "a mandate over the whole territory, with Constantinople as headquarters, would be something worth while," is the argument in Paris. It would cost us, we are told, only twenty years' work and a billion dollars and an army of 50,000 men. Worth while, undoubtedly, for the Turks; hardly for the Armenians or the Greeks or the United States.

What is the real motive of the men in the shadows who have persuaded some statesmen of talent and integrity to demand this billion-dollar gold brick? It will have to be a better argument than any of the pretexts so far advanced.

**A FREE ALL-ARMENIA**  
**vs.**  
**A TURANIAN-BOLSHEVIKI ALLIANCE**

By DR. W. D. P. BLISS

\* \* \*

The world must now choose between a free all-Armenia and a Turanian-Bolsheviki alliance, to be possibly reinforced by a Bolshevikized Germany.

The Powers of the Entente are now engaged in the task of partitioning Turkey. If the Allied policy be carried out, then the world will be in danger of being forced into the resumption of a war which will likely be more cruel and more destructive than the one that has been suspended. But it is not yet too late to avert the threatening catastrophe.

England is now in virtual occupation of Arabia, Mesopotamia and the major portion of Syria. France is in control of part of Syria, and is seeking to assert her indefensible claim for Cilicia, which is an essential part of Armenia. Italian troops are in occupation of part of Southern Anatolia, in the district of Iconium. The whole western coast of Asia Minor is in Greek hands. Armenia is rightly demanding independence, but the vital parts of her lands are being taken away from her by the Powers on the pretext that Armenian numbers have been reduced by Turkish massacres. Constantinople will likely be internationalized. And there remains only northwestern Anatolia to be allotted to the Turks.

The first hope of the Turk was that the Allies would disagree, just as the Balkan Allies did after the Balkan war of 1912-13. To this end Turkish diplomats have been busy, both in Constantinople and Paris, trying to foment jealousies and differences between Great Britain and France. But now, if Mr. Clemenceau and Mr. Lloyd George have got together, the Turk's last peaceful hope has gone.

Recent advices from Constantinople and all parts of Asia Minor indicate, however, that he will not submit to the complete dismemberment of his empire without at least one desperate effort with arms. But the Turk does not mean to fight single-handed. He counts on uniting with him his Turanian

and other neighbors, the Kurds, Persians, Tartars, Circasians, Afghans, Georgians and perhaps the Russian Bolsheviks.

The Cabinet recently formed in Constantinople is friendly to the Young Turk movement. There are three chief leaders of this party—Talaat, Enver and Djamal. It is significant that at present they are all out of Turkey trying to create alliances and, it appears, with success. Djamal is in Berne and in constant touch with Berlin. Talaat is reported in Berlin on his way to Moscow—converted to communism. Enver is stirring up the Tartars and the Kurds.

For months Bolshevik agitators have been stirring Afghanistan against England. The Turk hopes to unite Western Asia and Bolshevik Russia against the European powers—possibly Germany, too.

To appreciate the full situation, it is necessary to realize the possibilities of this alliance and put several facts together. The recent military successes of the Bolsheviks, and especially their present plan of sending overwhelming forces into Esthonia, mean that they are going to come into direct contact with Germany. If Germany this winter be hard pressed economically—and this seems now to be the indication—the Independent Socialists of Germany, who have already declared unanimously for the Bolsheviks, finding the Bolsheviks next door, may overturn the present government and extend Bolshevik rule from Berlin to Western Siberia. And then with the Bolsheviks, working, as they already are, in Central Asia, one may find an alliance that will spread from Berlin to Samarkand, and from the Arctic Ocean to the Persian Gulf.

This is what the Turk is now working for, and the present policy of the Allies is driving him into it. This Turkish policy is not new. Four years ago a Young Turk leader proclaimed the Socialism of Islam. In 1914 a Yeni-Turan (New Turanian) Society was formed in Constantinople, with Enver Bey as its President. In April, 1918, the Tasvir-i-Efkâr, as organ of the Young Turks (the Committee of Union and Progress), said it was their policy to penetrate at once Egypt and Turan (Central Asia), to open a road "to these Moslem countries such as Afghanistan and India," and "with the aid of Allah and the assistance of our Prophet," unite "300,000,000 of our coreligionists." These, of course, are Turkish figures.

Nor is this only a Turkish dream. It is the policy of the Bolsheviki as well. Weeks ago Trotsky said, "We Russians are good at languages. We can learn Hindustani." Central Asia is already largely in their hands. There is direct rail connection from Berlin through Central Asia to Samarkand, and even beyond to Andijan, on the borders of China. All Central Asia is Turanian. One may ride from the Bosphorus almost to Peking and talk some dialect of Turkish, or akin to Turkish, practically all the way. And Central Asia can supply Germany. In recent years Turkestan has been largely covered with cotton plantations. The grain and corn of Ukraina and Central Asia could feed all Eastern Europe and Western Asia. The sheep in Central Asia are said to number two per inhabitant. The Asiatic steppes are swarming with cattle. In the Caucasus, Ural, and Altai Mountains, and other regions, are coal, iron, copper, and other minerals, while the oil fields of Baku and elsewhere are well known. All of this is counted on by the clever Bolsheviki and the Young Turks. They at least know what they are doing.

Europe and America do not seem to know what they are doing.

\* \* \*

### **Armenia is the key to the situation.**

If you will look at the map, you will see that Armenia—stretching from the Caucasus to the Mediterranean—lies between Turkey and her Turanian allies. If Armenia be made independent and enabled to defend herself, she can cut off the Turk from his allies. This is what happened in the world war. Then the Turks sought a Turanian alliance. But the Armenians stood in their way. They said at Constantinople, "If we can win the Caucasus we can win the war."

It is not generally known that at a conference of representative Armenians meeting in a theatre at Erzurum in August, 1914, a Turanian delegation offered to create a free autonomous Armenia, under German guarantee, if the Armenians would support Turkey in the war. But the Armenians dared to say "No." It was that "no" that led to the massacre and deportation of the Armenians. However, it was with individual Kurds and Tartars, it was not fanaticism nor race hatred, nor greed, that determined the Turkish policy. The Turkish view was that it was a military neces-



sity. The Turk thought it a choice between deporting the Armenians and being themselves deported out of Constantinople and large portions of Asia Minor. They chose to deport the Armenians. That is the Turkish view of the deportations.

But the Turks did not get the Caucasus and they were defeated by the Armenians. Ihsan Pasha of the right wing of the Turkish Caucasus army said: "Had it not been for the Armenians we would have conquered the Caucasus." General Liman Von Sanders, the German commander in Syria, said: "The collapse of the Turkish Palestinian front was due to the fact that the Turks, against my orders and advice, sent all their available forces to the Caucasus and Azerbaijan, where they fought the Armenians." England was beaten by the Turks at the Dardanelles and Kut-el-Amara, but they were beaten by the Armenians in and near the Caucasus.

What the Armenians did then, they can do again. The Turks are not as strong as they were in the war. General Bagratuni, the Armenian General now in this country, says the Armenians can put into the field 50,000 trained men if they can be given ammunition, and with very little aid can cut off the Turks from Central Asia. This will bring peace there, and peace is all that Asia Minor needs.

\* \* \*

**Senator Charles S. Thomas**, Democrat, Member Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on December 16, 1918, said:

*"I heartily approve of the Lodge Resolution, and of every resolution which favors Armenian independence. I not only approve it heartily but I would go further and place under Armenian subjection as many Turks as may be necessary for the reconstruction of the Armenian country.*

*"Of course it is impossible to compensate Armenia for the terrible butchery of her people and impossible for the Allies to retaliate in kind upon the Turks; but upon that country should be placed the burden of retribution to the full extent that retribution may be in the power of the Allies to enforce."*

## A TURKISH SCHEME

By VAHAN CARDASHIAN

\* \* \*

On June 22, 1919, eight out of nine members of the Executive Committee of the American Committee for the Independence of Armenia, including Charles Evans Hughes, Elihu Root, Henry Cabot Lodge, John Sharp Williams, James W. Gerard, Alfred E. Smith, Frederic Courtland Penfield and Charles W. Eliot, sent the following cable message to the President, in Paris:

"We believe that without regard to party or creed the American people are deeply interested in the welfare of the Armenian people and expect to see the restoration of the independence of Armenia. When the unspeakable Turks were perpetrating their diabolical crimes upon men, women, and children of Armenia, American hearts were stirred with impotent horror. But with the triumph of right over primitive barbarity we had hoped that the Peace Conference would make it one of its first duties to take necessary steps to put a stop to the agony of Armenia and recognize her fidelity and services to our cause. We now believe that the prevailing insecurity of life and intense want in the major portion of Armenia make immediate action an imperative and sacred duty. We therefore respectfully urge that, as a first step in that direction, and without waiting for the conclusion of peace, either the Allies or America or both should at once send to Caucasus Armenia requisite food, munitions and supplies for fifty thousand men, and such other help as they may require to enable the Armenians to occupy the non-occupied parts of Armenia, within the boundaries defined in the Memorandum of the Delegation of Integral Armenia. We trust that it may be possible to secure prompt and full justice for Armenia."

Upon receipt of the foregoing message, the President designated a special committee of Americans to prepare a reply. This committee included also Mr. Henry Morgenthau. The committee's report, which was duly transmitted to Mr.

Justice Hughes, who had headed the cable message to the President, stated among other things, that, said committee had consulted with General Harbord, that, in its opinion, Colonel Haskell be designated as High Commissioner of the Powers to Armenia, and that General Harbord be commissioned to go to Armenia to investigate conditions there on behalf of the United States. General Harbord selected twenty-five experts and advisors for his staff, and the title of his mission was given as the "American Military Mission to Armenia." But, before the departure of the Mission for Armenia, its title was changed to "American Military Mission to the Near East." General Harbord, in seven weeks, traveled about ten thousand miles throughout countries whose areas are larger than those of France, Germany and Spain combined. The party stopped at a great many important centers for a few hours or a day or two at the most. Quite naturally it was a physical impossibility for him and his associates to conduct any serious investigation of conditions that obtained in the Near East.

General Harbord now brings us a report which, in substance, supports the joint mandate scheme which Mr. Morgenthau had been advocating for a year or more.\*

General Harbord's report substantially states that the assumption by America of a mandate for Armenia alone would be impracticable, (by Armenia he means Russian Armenia alone; the Turks having massacred or dispersed the Armenians in Turkish Armenia, he would offer Turkish Armenia to the Turks) and that the only mandate that should be considered by America, if any, should include Constantinople, Anatolia, Turkish Armenia and the Russian Transcaucasus.

The scheme that is thus being suggested presents two main distinct elements that should be considered; One is that, the Russian Transcaucasus, the title to which rests in Russia,—one of the allied powers—is to be detached from Russia, without regard to the will of Russia, and united with the major important part of what was formerly Turkey—a defeated enemy of the allied and associated powers; and the other is that, in this proposed copartnership, the principal

---

\* The report of the Harbord Mission has not been officially published. But, the nature of the recommendations of the Mission has been "forecasted" by credible news correspondents and commented upon broadcast. This article is a necessary comment on what has been forecasted. (See p. 29.)

racés shall be the Turco-Tartars, Armenians, Greeks and Georgians. That is, the Tartars, who are the kin and coreligionists of the Turks, will be brought in to help swell the Turkish numbers with the unavoidable result of reducing further the proportion of Christian numbers already reduced by Turkish massacres.

The scheme that is committed to our consideration is purely Turkish, without regard to the motives or reasons of its non-Turk proponents. The logic of this statement can be readily seen by reference to the principal purposes for the attainment of which Turkey entered the war. The Turks entered the war to expel from Turkey the entente influence and, after having eliminated the Armenian race which stood as a barrier between them and the Turanians beyond Armenia, to effect a junction with the Turco-Tartars of the Caucasus and the Trans-Caspian, and thus establish the foundation of a strong and homogeneous Turkish State, as a preliminary and necessary step in the direction of assuming the leadership of the Islamic world. Thus, a blanket mandate for the regions above described would be nothing else but the beginning of the fulfillment of a grandiose ambition which induced the Turk to embark on a war of unexampled brutality and destruction.\*

---

\* Damad Ferid (Sherif) Pasha, President of the Turkish Delegation to the Peace Conference, in his memorandum dated June 17, 1919, which he submitted to that body, put all the blame for the entry of Turkey into the war and the atrocities committed by the Turkish government during the war on the Committee of Union and Progress; absolved the Sultan and the government which the Turkish Delegation represented of all responsibility, and advocated that the territorial integrity of Turkey should be preserved. The writer of these lines has had sufficient personal association with Turkish ministers, ambassadors and officials of all grades—young and old—and also with the common Turkish people, to enable him to make the deliberate statement that murder and plunder of Christians have always been favored by an overwhelming majority of the Turks. The exceptions are so few that no particular attention need be given them in considering this phase of the Turkish question. Turkish history has been uniformly marked with blood, fire and destruction. The Turks have never ruled with justice and efficiency, and they have not, during their entire career, contributed one jot to the make-up of our civilization. Between 1821 and 1914 they massacred Greeks, Nestorians, Maronites, Bulgarians, Serbs, Armenians and Macedonians. Dr. Ahmed Riza, President of the Turkish Senate, who is also the leader of the so-called liberal wing of the Young Turk party, during his exile in Paris, justified in his paper, "Meshveret," the Armenian massacres of 1894-96. The Young Turks, in 1909, nine months after their accession to power, in conspiracy with Abd-ul-Hamid, planned and car-

It would appear that if moral considerations are not to play a determining role in connection with the adjustment of the Turkish case, considerations of policy and of reason should. It is repeatedly asserted that the numerical insufficiency of the Armenians makes it difficult to create at once an Armenian State within the boundaries claimed by the Armenians. The premise upon which this conclusion is based is not supported by the facts of the case. But assuming that it were so, then again it would be clearly inexpedient and unwise, from the point of view of the interest of civilized society, to establish a precedent whereby a ruling nation may destroy with impunity a subject race and then be allowed to profit by a majority gained by calculated murder. Also, it should be granted as a general principle, that no political entity that is not based on racial or national foundations or considerations can operate successfully. The history of the Turk is an eloquent testimony to the logic of this principle. Primarily the Turk has failed as a ruler be-

---

ried out the Cilician massacres, and Abd-ul-Hamid, for his own account, plotted an abortive coup against the Young Turks, which took place on the same day that the massacres were started. The ringleaders of the Cilician massacres remain unpunished. The so-called Turkish liberals, who lived in Switzerland during the Great War, and who are now at the helm of the new Turkish Government, did not raise a voice of protest against the Armenian horrors of 1915. No right-thinking person can offer one word of apology for the policy of the Turks against their subjects; and no intelligent person would advocate that the Turks should be entrusted once more with the government of any part of Turkey. The unfitness of the Turk to rule the subject races, or even himself, is no longer a debatable question. In so far as the Armenians are concerned, they are definitely resolved not to have any further direct or indirect political connection with the Turk. Armenia will no longer be a pawn in a selfish game. Unfortunately, there are to be found, even to-day, a few men here and there whose visions are so defective and whose souls are so completely imbued with the discredited Machiavellian school diplomacy, that they advocate doing "full justice" to the Armenians by assuring for them, under some makeshift arrangement, "security of life, honor and property," instead of giving them unconditionally what, according to the laws of God and man, belongs to them. Men with such mentality and morality have a very great responsibility for the ills of the past, and it would be manifestly unwise and immoral to pay the slightest heed to their arguments or advice in the adjustment of Turkish affairs, which must be based on reason and justice. As for the Armenian horrors of 1915, the direct responsibility for them belongs to the Turks, who perpetrated them; to the Germans, who possessed absolute power to prevent them, and did not, and to the neutral world, which did not make an earnest and timely effort to mitigate, if it could not prevent, this most ghastly and colossal crime in recorded history.

cause of his native barbarity and the superiority of the civilization of his Christian subjects over his civilization. But, even without these, the national individuality of the Armenian and the Greek, which distinguishes them from the Turk by origin, tradition, language, faith and aspirations, would have made impossible the successful government by the Turks of the Greeks and the Armenians. It should also be granted that a mere opportunity for the untrammelled enjoyment of cultural and religious autonomy cannot satisfy the instinctive aspirations for nationality of a nation gifted with the necessary attributes that make for nationhood. That the Turk, Greek and Armenian populations now overlap each other and are mixed with each other is true; but this can be no bar to the building up of separate nations of each, provided they possess necessary elements for separate statehood. The negative argument is based on artificial conditions which can and must be cured by repatriation, immigration and emigration. All newly created states go through processes of readjustment and of reintegration.

\* \* \*

Now for a clear understanding of the subject under discussion we must necessarily make a closer study of the geographical, ethnological and political aspects of the territories for which America is asked to become mandatary.

**The Russian Caucasus:** The Caucasus has an area of 180,703 square miles and an estimated population of 14,000,000. It comprises two geographical divisions, namely, Ciscaucasia or northern Caucasus, and Transcaucasia, or southern Caucasus.

**Ciscaucasia** contains four out of the fourteen administrative divisions of the old viceregency of the Caucasus. It has an area of 96,672 square miles and an estimated population of 7,000,000. (Ciscaucasia does not enter into the consideration of the subject under discussion, but is mentioned here by way of clarifying the explanations that are to follow.)

**Transcaucasia**, for which it is advocated that America should accept a mandate, together with certain portions of former Turkey, contains ten out of the fourteen administrative divisions of the old viceregency of the Caucasus. It has an area of 84,131 square miles, and comprises Georgia, Russian Armenia and Russian Azerbaijan. According to the Russian statistics of 1917, Transcaucasia had a popula-

tion of 6,995,400, of which 2,517,000 were Turco-Tartars, 1,786,800 Armenians, and 1,780,400 Georgians. Again, according to the Russian census of 1917, Russian Armenia, which is now known as the Republic of Armenia, had a population of 2,159,000, of which 1,293,000, or sixty per cent., were Armenians, and the next largest elements were four principal Moslem races, which together numbered 588,000, or twenty-seven per cent. of the population.

\* \* \*

In the spring of 1917, after the outbreak of the Russian Revolution, the then Kerensky Government created in and for Transcaucasia a special administrative body, styled as the Commissariat of Transcaucasia. But, in November, 1917, when the Bolsheviki overthrew the Kerensky Government and established the Soviet rule in Russia, Transcaucasia declined to recognize the authority of the Bolsheviki, and the Commissariat of Transcaucasia, on November 28, 1917, declared itself the supreme authority in Transcaucasia.

In February, 1918, the Seim, or the legislative assembly of Transcaucasia, convened in the city of Tiflis, accepted the resignation of the Commissariat, and, in its place, instituted a temporary government composed of several ministries. And under the force of the then prevailing external and internal political conditions, the Seim of Transcaucasia, on April 22, 1918, declared itself as an independent state under the name of the Federal Democratic Republic of Transcaucasia. Thus, the three principal peoples of Transcaucasia, Armenians, Georgians and the Tartars of Azerbaijan, became parties to the Federation, with their respective territories. But this Federal Republic of Transcaucasia scarcely lasted five weeks. The cause of its instability was the fact that the political tendencies of the three constituent nations were different, even conflicting with each other. The point at issue was the attitude of Transcaucasia to the war then still raging.

Since the beginning of the war, the sympathy of the Tartars was wholly with the Turks. When in December, 1917, the Russian armies abandoned the Caucasian front, and the Turkish forces started their forward march, the Tartars openly allied themselves with the Turks. The Georgians had for a long time been in communication with Germany. They were seeking the protection of Germany and were at all times ready to withdraw from the war, provided the independence of Georgia was recognized.



But the Armenians elected to remain and did remain loyal to the cause of the Entente and the associated powers; mustered together whatever fighting forces they could and, single-handed, challenged the advancing Turkish armies.

These internal conflicts daily becoming more emphatic, made it impossible for Armenians, Georgians and Tartars to work in harmony within the sphere of a single state.

Thus, on May 26, 1918, the Seim declared the termination of the Federal Republic of Transcaucasia and relinquished its authority. On the same day, Georgia declared her independence; and after two days, namely, on May 28, 1918, Armenia and Azerbaijan likewise declared their own independence.

From that day began the existence of the Republic of Armenia.

\* \* \*

The obvious unwisdom of America's accepting a mandate for Georgia and Azerbaijan is that those geographical units belong to Russia, and in view of their considerable natural wealth and important strategical positions, and also in view of the attitude that the Georgians and Tartars assumed toward Russia in the moment of her difficulties, one would be led to believe—and this belief is based on what the writer knows to be the views of Russian leaders on the subject—that reorganized Russia will not willingly permit Georgia and Azerbaijan to be detached from her body. In the case of Armenia, this difficulty does not exist. Armenians have been faithful to Russia throughout the war. Armenian resident ministers have been received by Kolchak and Denikine. Russian Armenia is not essential to the maintenance of Russian rule or influence in the Caucasus. Russian Armenia is a landlocked country, devoid of any particular economic value, such as Baku and Batum possess. Russian leaders have repeatedly stated that if Russian Armenia wishes to unite with Turkish Armenia, which they recognize as an inevitable necessity, then Russia will raise no objection to any such union. From the point of view of mandate, it should be stated that Russian Armenia alone is insufficient to constitute the nucleus of an independent state. But when we speak of Armenia, we mean Russian and Turkish Armenia united, the latter of which has outlets on the Black and Mediterranean Seas, and which is richer in resources than all the sixteen or more states which have been created or are likely to be created as a result of the Great War.



**The former Turkish Empire:** The former Turkish Empire has an area of 694,960 square miles and an estimated population of eighteen to twenty millions. It has six geographical divisions, namely—1. Turkey in Europe, 12,000 square miles. 2. Asia Minor or Anatolia, 193,800 square miles, of which 20,625 square miles constitute parts of Armenia Minor and Lesser Armenia or Cilicia. 3. Armenia, 101,000 square miles.\* 4. Syria, including Lebanon and Palestine, 80,285 square miles. 5. Mesopotamia, 156,500 square miles. 6. Arabia (Yemen and Hijaz) 172,000 square miles.

It is being suggested that America accept a blanket mandate for Constantinople, Anatolia and Armenia. The proposed arrangement excludes the Arabic speaking sections of former Turkey, and keeps together the Armenians, Greeks and Turks. The scheme that is thus proposed fully meets with the wishes of the Turks, and is absolutely opposed to the wishes and interests of the Armenians and the Greeks. There are no moral, political or economic considerations that would suggest the advisability of keeping together these three irreconcilable races under one political leadership. The impossibility of the task has been fully demonstrated, because apart from the consideration of the inaptitude of the Turk to rule alien races, or even himself, the Armenian and the Greek rightly aspire to become free and independent not only from Turkish association, but also from any other foreign domination. Of course, if America wishes to accept a

---

\* Turkish Armenia has an area of 101,000 square miles, and Russian Armenia an area of 26,491 square miles. What constitutes Turkish Armenia has been defined in four international documents since 1878. 1. Under Article 61 of the Treaty of Berlin, the provinces of Erzerum, Van, Bitlis, Harpoot, Diarbekir and Sivas, which have an area of 96,600 square miles, were recognized as constituting parts of Armenia. 2. Under the terms of the Ambassadors' Memorandum of 1895, said Six Provinces and Cilicia were recognized as Turkish Armenia. 3. Under the terms of the Reform Measure, dated February 8, 1914, agreed upon between Germany and Turkey on the one side, and Russia, representing the Entente and the Armenians, on the other, acting by direction of the Ambassadorial Conference of London of 1913, said Six Provinces and the Province of Trebizond, which have an area of 109,100 square miles, were considered as parts of Turkish Armenia. At the suggestion of Germany, Cilicia, or Lesser Armenia (the Bagdad Railroad crosses through it), was to become a separate subject of treatment. 4. Under Article XXIV of the terms of the armistice granted to Turkey by the Allies, dated November 1, 1918, the above mentioned Six Provinces were referred to as the "Six Armenian Vilayets."

mandate for Constantinople, or for Anatolia, or even for the moon, it is for America to determine. But if the suggestion for the acceptance by America of a unitary mandate for the three geographical entities is being urged in the interest of Armenia, then it should be clearly and emphatically stated that the interest of Armenia does not require any such arrangement.

The scheme of a joint mandate is being advocated by the Turks, and for the Turks, because it serves the Pan-Turanian purpose of the Turks. The so-called Nationalist Government of Kemel Pasha is also advocating a joint mandate. Under that scheme the Armenians of Constantinople, Anatolia, Georgia, and Azerbaijan would have no inducement to go back to Armenia. Under that scheme, the Armenians would wisely remain where they are, because with the expiration of the term of mandate, the Turks will be in a more favorable position than ever before to assault Armenian life, honor and property. Otherwise, the mandatary of those regions must remain there forever.

The proponents of joint mandate assert that a mandate for Armenia alone is impracticable because they seek to confine Armenia to Russian Armenia only—about one-fifth of Armenia—which has no access to the sea and is alone insufficient in the economic sense. Under their scheme, the Turks, having succeeded in destroying or driving out of their homes a million and a half Armenians of Turkish Armenia, ought to be permitted to profit by their crimes.\*

A point which has been repeatedly mentioned as constituting an argument against the creation of an Armenian State is that within the Armenia to be Armenians will be in the minority. This view is not founded on facts. In 1913, the population of Turkish Armenia was estimated at 3,788,-

---

\* Any proposition for the settlement of the Armenian case which does not immediately put all of Armenia on the map as a separate Armenian State, will not be acceptable to the Armenians. The case of Armenia must not be mixed or bound up with that of any other geographical division or racial entity of Turkey, or with the alleged special interest or claim of another nation. Armenia belongs to the Armenians in the same sense that France belongs to the French. The Turks and the Kurds, who are invaders and wrong-doers, may remain in Armenia, if they so elect, and they will be assured of an impartial rule; but, their spurious and pretended claims as to their own numbers, etc., have no more weight and validity than the claim of a criminal to the possession of the house of his neighbor whom he has murdered. The slightest suggestion of willingness on the part of the Powers to lend

000, of which 1,403,000 were Armenians, 1,635,000 Turks, Kurds and other Moslems, and the balance other Christian and non-Christian communities. On this estimated population was based the decision of the Ambassadorial Conference at London, in 1913, by and under which Turkish Armenia, exclusive of Cilicia, was placed under international control. It should, however, be conceded that the Turks claim a larger number of population for themselves than the number conceded by the Armenians. As a matter of fact, Guinet, French statistician, puts the number of the Moslem population of Armenia at 2,400,000, which is 462,000 more than conceded by the Armenians, since Guinet includes Kizil-Bachiz and Yezidiz among the Turks, which the Armenians rightly do not. But even on the basis given by Guinet, the Armenians make a good showing. In 1914, there were 2,008,000 Armenians in Turkey, one million of whom have possibly perished. So that with the repatriation of the Armenian refugees who are now in Russian Armenia (350,000), and in Mesopotamia, Syria and Anatolia (about 250,000), there will be three-quarters of a million Armenians in Turkish Armenia. The Moslem elements in Turkish Armenia now hardly number between a million and a million and a half. (By Moslem elements we understand, Turks, Kurds, Circassians and others). It should be recalled that the President of the Turkish Delegation to the Peace Conference stated that the Moslems of Turkey have been reduced in numbers by no less than three millions. It is a fact that the largest proportion of the Moslem losses was suffered in Turkish Armenia, as a result of Russian invasion, when the Moslems fled westerly, and died by the thousands from pestilence, starvation and exposure. In the fall of

---

ear to the arguments of the Turks, or of those who argue like Turks, will be tantamount to condonation and approval of the Turk's crimes. It will mean that they are willing to take advantage of the result of their own omission. It will mean that they are willing to establish a precedent whereby a ruling nation may destroy a subject race, as a means of disposing of the rightful claims of that race. The point at issue is one of essential morality which cannot be determined by hair-splitting arguments as to relative numbers. That sort of pretended evidence by criminals must be ruled out by a court of equity. Had the Powers done their duty since 1878, there would have been over four million more Armenians than there are to-day. The fact is, however, that with the union of the Russian and Persian Armenias to Turkish Armenia, the Armenians will constitute not less than sixty-six per cent. of the population of the reunited Armenia.

1917, the normal Turk and Kurd population of about 551,000 in the Provinces of Van, Bitlis and Erzurum had been reduced to 96,000, and in the City of Diarbekir, out of a resident and refugee Moslem population of 63,000 only 6,000 were left.

\* \* \*

**To recapitulate:** There are 1,293,000 native Armenians in Russian Armenia; there will be three-quarters of a million native Armenians in Turkish Armenia; there are 494,000 Armenians in Georgia and Azerbaijan, 100,000 Armenians in Persian Armenia, and about a half million Armenians in other regions, the great majority of whom are now prepared to migrate to Armenia, provided that Armenia include her natural boundaries. Thus the question of population, as it has been stated above, will be adjusted by repatriation, emigration and immigration. Armenians will immigrate into Armenia, and a great many Turks will emigrate to Anatolia, where there is ample room for them. We estimate that there will be in the proposed Armenian State a minimum of two and a half million Armenians and a maximum of one million Moslems, out of a population of about four and a half millions.

In connection with the question of the proportion of populations, it is well to recall the facts that the Turks, in 1865, constituted about fifteen per cent. of the population of the then Turkish Empire; that in 1914, they constituted not more than twenty-five per cent. of the population of Turkey, and that they are now the minority population even in Constantinople.

It would appear that the principal reason for the hesitancy on the part of America to extend a helping hand to Armenia to organize her government is that the leaders of the Entente Powers have lacked necessary clarity in their public declarations on the subject. When it is stated that the Powers of the Entente have been overburdened with responsibilities in Asia and in Africa, and that it is for America to carry a part of the white man's burden, the clear implication is that they are unwilling, if offered the opportunity, to add Armenia to the list of their possessions. That is not the fact. Great Britain and France are not carrying any burdens in administering Mesopotamia or Syria or any other part of the former Turkish Empire. They have gone there willingly, and they would be extremely

reluctant to get out of there. They would be very anxious indeed to take hold of Armenia if it were offered to them, but the fact is that Great Britain does not want France in Armenia, and France does not want Great Britain there. These observations should serve to dissipate the fear that has naturally found lodgment in the minds of a great many Americans that America is being offered a gold brick by being asked to help Armenia. It is likewise erroneous to assume that America, by undertaking the task of helping Armenia, would be protecting directly or indirectly the Entente possessions in the east. The specific purpose for which America is to go into Armenia is to help the Armenians organize their government, and not to protect the Armenian frontiers against any hostile attack in which, if one were to take place, all the nations would and should be equally interested. Armenia will have on her northern, northeastern and northwestern frontiers Russia, without whose acquiescence Russian Armenia cannot be made a part of Armenia, and with her acquiescence no trouble can be expected from that source. On her southeastern frontiers there are Persia, Mesopotamia and Syria, which will be under the influence or guidance of Great Britain and France. On her western frontier there will be a reduced Turkey, whose army will be demobilized, and whose population will not be larger than the Armenian population of Armenia. It is therefore difficult to see as to how and why America should be confronted with any contingency that would impose upon her the task of fighting hostile nations by helping Armenia. At this moment Armenia asks of America a few battalions for the moral effect that their presence will necessarily have; food, munitions and supplies for an army of 30,000 men in Armenia, and food for civil population until the next crop. Give the Armenian arms, and the Turk, the Kurd and the Tartar will leave him undisturbed.

For her unyielding fidelity to the Christian faith, for her heroic loyalty to the allied cause, and for the services that she will hereafter render to the cause of civilization in the Near East, Armenia is entitled to the prior support and sympathy of America. It is through America only that she can hope to secure the fulfillment of her aspiration of centuries—the unity and independence of historic Armenia.

## ARMENIA'S SHARE IN THE WINNING OF THE WAR

**LORD ROBERT CECIL**

on October 3, 1918, wrote:

"In the beginning of the War, the Russian Armenians organized volunteer forces, which bore the brunt of some of the heaviest fighting in the Caucasian campaign. After the Russian Army's breakdown last year, the Armenians took over the Caucasian front (over two hundred miles long), fought the Turks for five months, and thus rendered very important services to the British Army in Mesopotamia. (They also captured Baku from the Turko-Tartars, and held it from March to July, 1918, until the arrival of the British.) They served alike in the British, French and American armies, and have borne their part in General Allenby's victory in Palestine. The services rendered by the Armenians to the common cause can never be forgotten."

**EX-PREMIER KERENSKY**

on August 20, 1918, said:

"At the outbreak of the War, the Turks captured Sary-Kamish, and were marching on Tiflis. All the high officials, including the Viceroy, were preparing for a hasty flight. Of all the races of the Caucasus, the Armenians alone stuck to their posts, organized volunteer forces and, by the side of their Russian comrades, faced the formidable assaults of the enemy, and turned his victorious march into a disastrous rout."

**GEN. VON LUDENDORFF,**  
in his book, states:

"The principal factor that forced the breakdown of the German Army in the west was due to the lack of fuel supply, because the Turks did not get to Baku in time."

It should be recalled that the Russian-Caucasus Army went home in December, 1917; that the Turks and Tartars fought the Armenians, who remained the only faithful allies of the allied and associated powers, and that the Turks did not reach Baku until September, 1918; that is, eight months after the defection of Russia.

**GEN. LIMAN VON SANDERS,**  
German Commander in Syria, following Turkey's surrender.

"The collapse of the Turkish Palestinian front was due to the fact that the Turks, against my orders and advice, sent all their available forces to the Caucasus and Azarbeijan, where they fought the Armenians."

**GEN. ALLENBY,**  
After Turkey's debacle in Palestine, telegraphed to President Armenian National Delegation, Paris:

"I am proud to have Armenian contingents under my command. They fought brilliantly and took a leading part in the victory."

## ARMENIA AND THE ARMENIANS

The Armenians, a race of the Indo-European stock, (Alpine Aryan like the Swiss, North Italian and most Greeks) about 1300 years B. C., left their original home in Thrace, Southeastern Europe, crossed the Bosphorous over into Bithynia, pushed Easterly into Cappadocia, and Northern Cilicia, and in about the 8th century B. C. reached the region of the mountain of Ararat, where they founded the State of Armenia.\* **“Herodotus”; “Plonius”; “J. De Morgan.”**

King Herachia of Armenia was an ally of Nebuched-nezzar in the capture of Jerusalem 600 B. C. King Tigranes of Armenia was the ally of Cyrus the Great in the conquest of Babylonia and the consequent liberation of the Jews from 70 years' captivity 538 B. C.

Under Tigranes the Great, (fl. 1st Century B. C.) Armenia attained the height of her glory and power, and extended from the Caspian to the Black Sea and the Mediterranean, from the Caucasus to the Mesopotamian plains, with an area exceeding 500,000 square miles and a population of 25,000,000. **“Langlois”; “Lanormant.”**

**Religion.**—Armenia has the first Christian National Church in the world. Apostles Thaddæus and Bartholomew preached the Gospel in Armenia. Since, in unbroken succession, the Church has had 137 Pontiffs, whose seat, since 309, (with occasional transfers elsewhere) has been at Etchmiadzin, the Great Monastery, in Russian Armenia.

Of the 4,470,000 of Armenians the world over (in 1912), about 150,000 are, since 1830, under the jurisdiction of the Church of Rome; about 100,000 have joined, since 1847, Protestant denominations, through the American missionaries, and the remainder are the adherents of the Apostolic Church of Armenia. To-day the Church has 100 Bishops and Archbishops; about 10,000 ecclesiastics of lower rank and 3909 parishes.

---

\* The Illyrians, who are the present Albanians, the Phrygians, who have been subsequently merged in the Greeks, and the Greeks were the immediate neighbors of the Armenians in Thrace, and they all belong to the same branch of the Aryan family.

**Bertrand Bareilles** writes as follows of this Church :

"In the essentially democratic constitution of the Armenian Church, there is inherent a liberality of thought; and the first thing which strikes us when we study the framework of her society is, that her clergy do not form a distinct and separate class."

**Post-Christian Period.**—Following her conversion to Christianity, Armenia was in continual death-grapple with the Zoroasterian Persia and the ever surging hordes of barbarians from the wilds of Asia. Armenia was the highway upon which crossed and recrossed the alien enemies of civilization—the Arab, Mongol, Tartar, Turk. The Armenians, isolated and separated from the rest of civilization, represented the West in the East and fought its first battles. And now exhausted by the swelling and pressing tide of the pagan and Moslem forces, they retreated Westerly and set up the Kingdom of Lesser Armenia, along the coast of the Mediterranean, in 1080. Here they became the active allies of the Crusaders. But with the collapse of that unfortunate movement they fell a prey to the wrath and vengeance of the Mameluke Sultan of Egypt. King Lean VI, after eight months' defense of Sis, his capital, laid down his arms in May, 1375, and thus ended the independence of Armenia. Armenia was eventually divided between Turkey, Russia and Persia. "**Dulaurier**"; "**Stubbs**"; "**Neumann**."

Sir Edwin Pears makes the following observations about them :

"They are physically a fine race. The men are usually tall, well built and powerful. The women have a healthy look about them which suggests good motherhood. They are an ancient people of the same Indo-European race as ourselves, and speak an allied language. During long centuries, they held their own against Persians, Arabs, Turks and Kurds. Whenever they have had a fighting chance they proved their courage. . . . A large proportion of them remained tillers of the soil. In commerce they are successful not only in Turkey, but in France, England and India. Though subject to persecution for centuries under Moslem rule (because of their Christian faith, their superior intelligence, their industry and thrift), they have always managed to have their race respected."

**Language—Literature—Arts—Music.**—Villefroï, Doré St. Martin, Hubschmann recognize the Armenian as one of the Indo-Germanic languages that has attained the highest



degree of development, by a varied and ancient intellectual culture.

Sir Henry Norman considers the ancient, mediaeval and modern Armenian literature, including works of imagination, novels, romance and poetry, comparable to any other literature.

F. D. Lynch, referring to the architecture of a few of the 1,001 churches and other ruins of Ani, the capital of Armenia in the 9th century, expresses the opinion that the Armenians were the originators of the Gothic style of architecture, and further says: "These monuments of an ancient civilization leave no doubt that the Armenian people may be included in the small number of races who have shown themselves susceptible of the highest culture."

Sir Edwin Pears considers the Armenians as the most artistic and musically talented race in Turkey.

#### **Armenians in Foreign Lands and Under Alien Rule.—**

During and after their independence, many Armenians distinguished themselves, almost in every field of the life of the country in which they settled.

Nerses, the favorite of Theodora and the Commander-in-Chief of the legions of Justinian; Dadarshis, the renowned general of Darius Hystaspis; Proersios, the teacher of St. Gregory Nazianzen, of St. Basil, and of Julian the Apostate; Isaac, the Exarch of Ravenna, who held sway over Italy (625-643) were Armenians. According to Gelzer, it was during the reigns of the twelve Armenian Emperors, such as Maurice, Leo, Basil, Zemiscas, and of Empress Theodora Augusta, that Byzantium reached the zenith of her glory and power.

In 1410, the Armenian nobility fought with the armies of Poland against the German invaders, and thus contributed to the victory of Grunwaldt, without which "the German deluge would have effaced Poland."

In 1683, five thousand Armenian warriors aided Sobieski in beating back the high tide of the Turk invasion from the gate of Vienna, which victory saved Europe from the threatened domination of the Turk.

In 1812 it was an Armenian General, Prince Pakraduni, that matched his skill against that of Napoleon at Moscow, and thus struck the mortal blow at the ambition of the Great Emperor.

During the Russo-Turkish war of 1877, of the dozen or more Armenian generals in the Russian army, Loris Melikoff

was the Commander-in-Chief of the Caucasus forces, who subsequently became the Prime Minister of Russia and drafted her first constitution.

According to Lord Cromer, "the Armenians have attained the highest administrative ranks, and have at times exercised a decisive influence upon the conduct of public affairs in Egypt."

The first Prime Minister of Egypt, following British occupation, was an Armenian. Lucasz, who was the Prime Minister of Hungary in 1913, was also an Armenian.

Prince Malcolm, one of the first leaders of the Persian reform movement; Aivazovsky, the greatest marine painter of the 19th century; Althen, who introduced to France the cultivation of rubic tinctorum; Manuelian, one of the foremost of the histologists of our time; the late Dr. Kassabian of Philadelphia, who was one of the leading Roentgen ray investigators in the world; the late Governor Thomas Corwin of Ohio, who also at one time became Secretary of the U. S. Treasury, belong to the Armenian race.

**In Turkey**, the Armenians have been one of the principal constructive forces, despite the oppressive and obstructive Turk rule, and they have, together with the Greek, supplied the Turk with his manifold wants. Even the Turkish printing press, the Turkish grammar and the Turkish theatre owe their origin to the initiative of the Armenian.

General Sherif Pasha, the former Turk Ambassador at Stockholm, made the following statement in October, 1915:

"If there is a race which has been closely connected with the Turk by its fidelity, by its services to the country, by the statesmen and functionaries of talent it has furnished, by the intelligence which it has manifested in all domains—commerce, industry, science and the arts—it is certainly the Armenian."

Prof. Von Eucken, the foremost German authority on the Near East, says of them: "Any one who is to some extent acquainted with the political and intellectual history of the Armenian nation, and knows with what enormous difficulties this people of an ancient civilization has had to struggle, and has especially to-day to contend with, will be filled with sincere respect for a people who could accomplish so much in the midst of all those tribulations."

Dr. Paul Rohrbach, the well known German Orientalist, writes as follows:

"We may say without exaggeration that not only in Armenia proper, but far beyond its boundaries, the economic life of Turkey rests, in great part, upon the Armenians."

Dr. Barton, Secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, formerly President of the Euphrates College, Armenia, writes as follows in the October issue, 1918, of *The World Court*:

"In the modern intellectual revival in Turkey the Armenians were the first to respond. They not only eagerly fostered modern education among themselves and in their own country, but thousands of bright Armenian young men and women have studied in the educational centers of the world and have won distinction by the superiority of their intellect and their unconquerable desire and zeal for education. There is no race on the face of the earth more worthy, by its inheritance, its intrinsic worth, its intellectual capacity and ability, its traditional industry, its peaceful temper and spirit, its domestic hopes and purposes, of a free and independent existence. In no commercial enterprise, no form of industry, no profession, and in no institution of learning in Turkey or elsewhere do the Armenians take second place.

"It was at this race that the blow of destruction was primarily aimed by the government of the Young Turks in the winter of 1914 and the spring of 1915. This historic, educated and refined people were maltreated in a thousand forms, starved and exiled. Its greatest crime is that in contact with its Turkish neighbors, it has far outstretched all the rest in enterprise and industry; and in religion it has stood firmly against the persecution of its Mohammedan over-lords, refusing to exchange Jesus Christ for Mohammed."



## The Population of Armenia in 1914

	Turkish Armenia	Caucasian Armenia	Total	
Armenians .....	1,403,000	1,296,000	2,699,000	} Christians
Greeks, Russians, Nestorians, etc.....	447,000	65,000	512,000	
Turks .....	943,000	61,000	1,005,000	} 2,308,000
Tartars .....		537,000	537,000	
Kurds and Turkomans.....	482,000	75,000	556,000	} Moslems
Lazas, Circassians, Arabs, etc.....	210,000		210,000	
Kizil-baches, Zazas, Yezidis, etc.....	303,000	38,000	341,000	} 341,000
	<u>3,788,000</u>	<u>2,072,000</u>	<u>5,860,000</u>	
				Other Religions

52

## Total Number of Armenians in 1914

<b>In Armenia:</b>			
Turkish Armenia .....	1,403,000	} 2,699,000	
Caucasian Armenia .....	1,296,000		
<b>Contiguous Regions of Armenia:</b>			
The other regions of Turkish Asia.....	440,000	} 1,088,000	
The other regions of the Caucasus.....	508,000		
In Persia .....	140,000		
<b>In More Distant Regions:</b>			
In Constantinople and in Turkey in Europe.....	183,000	} 683,000	
In Russia and in the Caucasus.....	250,000		
In Europe, in Egypt and India.....	120,000		
In America .....	130,000		
Total .....			<u>4,470,000</u>



THE STAFF OF THE SECOND BATTALION OF ARMENIAN VOLUNTEERS IN THE CAUCASUS IN NOVEMBER, 1914.

In addition to over 160,000 men Russian Armenians contributed to the Russian Army, Armenians raised volunteer contingents which, according to Russian and Turkish testimony, saved the Russian Caucasus front from certain disaster in 1914, and later made possible the successes of the Russian arms on that front. Following the break-down of the Russian Army in the Fall of 1917, Armenians organized volunteer legions, which fought the Turkish Army for seven months, and thus saved not only the position of the British Army in Mesopotamia and indirectly contributed to the success of the British Army in Palestine, but made it impossible for the Turks to effect a junction with the millions of Tartars of the Caucasus, which was the principal part of the scheme of the Turkish campaign on the Caucasus front.



ARMENIAN VOLUNTEERS WHO FOUGHT IN PALESTINE IN SEPTEMBER AND OCTOBER, 1918, UNDER THE SUPREME  
COMMAND OF GENERAL ALLENBY.

The Armenians contributed to the Palestine front eight battalions, which, according to General Allenby, took a leading part in the decisive victory over the Turks. These troops, officially designated as the "Armenian Legion," are now in occupation of Cilicia or Lesser Armenia, and certain parts of Armenia Minor and Major.



THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE  
FOR THE  
INDEPENDENCE OF ARMENIA  
ONE MADISON AVENUE  
NEW YORK  

---

TELEPHONE 2545 GRAMERCY

To the Editor:

You are at liberty to use, without any restriction, the contents of the book entitled, "The Joint Mandate Scheme."

(*Signed*) JAMES W. GERARD



# DATE DUE

APR 21 1969

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

